

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed on April 24, 2007, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

By means of the present amendment, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which better conforms to U.S. practice.

By means of the present amendment, claims 1-2 and 4-5 have been amended for non-statutory reasons, such as for better form including beginning the dependent claims with 'The' instead of 'A', and deleting reference designations typically used in European practice that are known to not limit the scope of the claims. Claims 1-2 and 4-5 were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings because box 1 in FIG 2 is not labeled. In response, FIG 2 has been

amended to include a label for box 1. A replacement sheet including FIG 2 is enclosed. Applicants respectfully request approval of the enclosed proposed drawing changes.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification for certain informalities. In response, the specification has been amended to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner as well as another informality. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without agreeing with the Examiner, and in the interest of furthering the prosecution and expediting allowance of the present Application, claims 1-2 and 5 have been amended for better form that more clearly recites statutory subject matter. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §101 has been overcome and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In addition,

claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) U.S. Patent 5,808,462 (Fujii). Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that claim 4 contains allowable subject matter. However, Applicants have not rewritten claim 4 in independent form, since it is believed that amended independent claims 1-2 and 5, are allowable over AAPA and Fujii for at least the following reasons.

In rejecting claim 3, at the bottom of page 6 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner correctly noted that AAPA does not teach or suggest calculating a sum of the inverse sine and cosine values. Column 6, lines 1-16; column 6, line 65 to column 7, line 8; and column 8, line 55 to column 9, line 6 of Fujii are cited in an attempt to remedy the deficiencies in AAPA.

It is respectfully submitted that the noted sections of Fujii merely disclose calculating the inverse cosine and are completely silent and do not teach or suggest anything about an inverse sine. Further, there is no apparent reason in the prior art for one skilled in the art to suggest using the inverse sine in addition to the inverse cosine, particularly since Fujii derives sufficient information from the inverse cosine, such as the phase of the AC

signal.

It is respectfully submitted the AAPA and Fujii do not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 2 and 5, which, amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided) :

calculating ... an output sum of an inverse sine value of the amplitude corrected sine component ($\sin(x)$) and an inverse cosine value of the amplitude corrected cosine component ($\cos(x)$).

These features are nowhere taught or suggested in AAPA and Fujii. Rather, Fujii merely discloses using the inverse cosine to determine the phase of an AC signal.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 2 and 5 should be allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of

argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By Dicran Halajian
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
July 16, 2007

Enclosure: Replacement drawing sheet (1 sheet including FIG 2)
New Abstract

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101